arXiv:1408.0109v1 [math.CO] 1 Aug 2014

Trees with Large Neighborhood Total Domination Number

Michael A. Henning* and Kirsti Wash†

Department of Pure and Applied Mathematics
University of Johannesburg
Auckland Park, 2006, South Africa
Email: mahenning@uj.ac.za
Email: kirstiw@g.clemson.edu

Abstract

In this paper, we continue the study of neighborhood total domination in graphs first studied by Arumugam and Sivagnanam [Opuscula Math. 31 (2011), 519–531]. A neighborhood total dominating set, abbreviated NTD-set, in a graph G is a dominating set S in G with the property that the subgraph induced by the open neighborhood of the set S has no isolated vertex. The neighborhood total domination number, denoted by $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a NTD-set of G. Every total dominating set is a NTD-set, implying that $\gamma(G) \le \gamma_{\rm nt}(G) \le \gamma_t(G)$, where $\gamma(G)$ and $\gamma_t(G)$ denote the domination and total domination numbers of G, respectively. Arumugam and Sivagnanam posed the problem of characterizing the connected graphs G of order $n \ge 3$ achieving the largest possible neighborhood total domination number, namely $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G) = \lceil n/2 \rceil$. A partial solution to this problem was presented by Henning and Rad [Discrete Applied Mathematics 161 (2013), 2460–2466] who showed that 5-cycles and subdivided stars are the only such graphs achieving equality in the bound when n is odd. In this paper, we characterize the extremal trees achieving equality in the bound when n is even. As a consequence of this tree characterization, a characterization of the connected graphs achieving equality in the bound when n is even can be obtained noting that every spanning tree of such a graph belongs to our family of extremal trees.

Keywords: Domination; Total domination; Neighborhood total domination.
AMS subject classification: 05C69

*Research supported in part by the South African National Research Foundation and the University of Johannesburg

†Research supported in part by the University of Johannesburg

1 Introduction

In this paper we continue the study of a parameter, called the neighborhood total domination number, that is squeezed between arguably the two most important domination parameters, namely the domination number and the total domination number. A *dominating set* in a graph G is a set S of vertices of G such that every vertex in $V(G) \setminus S$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in S. The *domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of G. A *total dominating set*, abbreviated a TD-set, of a graph G with no isolated vertex is a set S of vertices of G such that every vertex in $V(G)$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in S. The *total domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma_t(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a TD-set of G. The literature on the subject of domination parameters in graphs up to the year 1997 has been surveyed and detailed in the two books [5, 6]. Total domination is now well studied in graph theory. For a recent book on the topic, see [10]. A survey of total domination in graphs can also be found in [7].

Arumugam and Sivagnanam [1] introduced and studied the concept of neighborhood total domination in graphs. A *neighbor* of a vertex v is a vertex different from v that is adjacent to v. The *neighborhood of a set* S is the set of all neighbors of vertices in S. A *neighborhood total dominating set*, abbreviated NTD-set, in a graph G is a dominating set S in G with the property that the subgraph induced by the open neighborhood of the set S has no isolated vertex. The *neighborhood total domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a NTD-set of G. A NTD-set of G of cardinality $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G)$ is called a $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G)$-*set*.

Every TD-set is a NTD-set, while every NTD-set is a dominating set. Hence the neighborhood total domination number is bounded below by the domination number and above by the total domination number as first observed by Arumugam and Sivagnanam in [1].

Observation 1 ([1, 8]) *If G is a graph with no isolated vertex, then $\gamma(G) \le \gamma_{\rm nt}(G) \le \gamma_t(G)$.*

1.1 Terminology and Notation

For notation and graph theory terminology not defined herein, we refer the reader to [5]. Let G be a graph with vertex set $V(G)$ of order $n = |V(G)|$ and edge set $E(G)$ of size $m = |E(G)|$, and let v be a vertex in V. We denote the *degree* of v in G by $d_G(v)$. The minimum degree among the vertices of G is denoted by $\delta(G)$. A vertex of degree one is called a *leaf* and its neighbor a *support vertex*. We denote the set of leaves in G by $L(G)$, and the set of support vertices by $S(G)$. A support vertex adjacent to two or more leaves is a *strong support vertex*. For a set $S \subseteq V$, the subgraph induced by S is denoted by $G[S]$. A 2-*packing* in G is a set of vertices that are pairwise at distance at least 3 apart in G.

A *cycle* and *path* on n vertices are denoted by C_n and P_n, respectively. A *star* on $n \ge 2$ vertices is a tree with a vertex of degree $n-1$ and is denoted by $K_{1,n-1}$. A *double star* is a

tree containing exactly two vertices that are not leaves (which are necessarily adjacent). A *subdivided star* is a graph obtained from a star on at least two vertices by subdividing each edge exactly once. The subdivided star obtained from a star $K_{1,4}$, for example, is shown in Figure 1. We note that the smallest two subdivided stars are the paths P_3 and P_5. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of all subdivided stars. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}$. If $F = P_3$, we select a leaf of F and call it the *link vertex* of F, while if $F \neq P_3$, the *link vertex* of F is the central vertex of F.



Figure 1: A subdivided star.

The *open neighborhood* of v is the set $N_G(v) = \{u \in V \mid uv \in E\}$ and the *closed neighborhood of* v is $N_G[v] = \{v\} \cup N_G(v)$. For a set $S \subseteq V$, its *open neighborhood* is the set $N_G(S) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G(v)$, and its *closed neighborhood* is the set $N_G[S] = N_G(S) \cup S$. If the graph G is clear from the context, we simply write $\mathrm{d}(v)$, $N(v)$, $N[v]$, $N(S)$ and $N[S]$ rather than $d_G(v)$, $N_G(v)$, $N_G[v]$, $N_G(S)$ and $N_G[S]$, respectively. As observed in [8] a NTD-set in G is a set S of vertices such that $N[S] = V$ and $G[N(S)]$ contains no isolated vertex.

A *rooted tree* distinguishes one vertex r called the *root*. For each vertex $v \neq r$ of T, the *parent* of v is the neighbor of v on the unique (r, v)-path, while a *child* of v is any other neighbor of v. A *descendant* of v is a vertex u such that the unique (r, u)-path contains v. Let $C(v)$ and $D(v)$ denote the set of children and descendants, respectively, of v, and let $D[v] = D(v) \cup \{v\}$. The *maximal subtree* at v is the subtree of T induced by $D[v]$, and is denoted by T_v.

2 Known Results

The following upper bound on the neighborhood total domination number of a connected graph in terms of its order is established in [8].

Theorem 2 ([8]) *If G is a connected graph of order $n \geq 3$, then $\gamma_{\mathrm{nt}}(G) \leq (n+1)/2$.*

In this paper we consider the following problem posed by Arumugam and Sivagnanam [1] to characterize the connected graphs of largest possible neighborhood total domination number.

Problem 1 ([1]) *Characterize the connected graphs G of order n for which $\gamma_{\mathrm{nt}}(G) = \lceil n/2 \rceil$.*

A partial solution to this problem was presented by Henning and Rad [8] who provided the following characterization in the case when n is odd.

Theorem 3 ([8]) *Let $G \neq C_5$ be a connected graph of order $n \geq 3$. If $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G) = (n+1)/2$, then $G \in \mathcal{F}$.*

As first observed in [8], a characterization in the case when n is even and the minimum degree is at least 2 follows readily from a result on the restrained domination number of a graph due to Domke, Hattingh, Henning and Markus [4]. Let $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_5$ be the five graphs shown in Figure 2.



Figure 2: The five graphs $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_5$.

Theorem 4 ([8]) *Let $G \neq C_5$ be a connected graph of order $n \geq 4$ with $\delta(G) \geq 2$. If $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G) = n/2$, then $G \in \{B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4, B_5\}$.*

3 The Family $\mathcal{T}$ of Trees

In this section we define a family of trees $\mathcal{T}$ as follows. Let T_0 be an arbitrary tree. Let T_1 be the tree obtained from T_0 by the following operation: for each vertex $x \in V(T_0)$, either add a new vertex and an edge joining it to x or add a new path P_3 and an edge joining its central vertex to x. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the family of all trees T that can be obtained from T_1 by performing the following operation:

- Choose a set of leaves, L_1, in T_1, that form a 2-packing (possibly $L_1 = \emptyset$). For each vertex $v \in L_1$, add $k \geq 0$ vertex-disjoint copies of P_2 and join v to exactly one end of each added copy of P_2. We refer to these k added copies of P_2 as *appended* P_2s associated with x.



Figure 3: A tree in the family $\mathcal{T}$.

A tree in the family $\mathcal{T}$ is illustrated in Figure 3. For ease of reference, we introduce some terminology for a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$. We use the standard notation $[k] = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. First note that given a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$, a tree T_0 used to construct the tree T may not be unique. That

is, in some cases we may be able to choose two distinct trees T_0 and T_0' such that T is obtained from either T_0 or T_0' by performing different combinations of the above operations. Therefore, we refer to T_0 as an *underlying tree of* T, and we refer to T_1 as the *corresponding base tree of* T_0.

The vertex set $V(T_1)$ of T_1 can be partitioned into sets $V_1, \ldots, V_\ell$ such that each V_i contains exactly one vertex of T_0 and $T[V_i] \in \{P_2, K_{1,3}\}$ for each $i \in [\ell]$. We say that $T[V_i]$ is a P_2-*unit* of T_1 if $T[V_i] = P_2$ and $T[V_i]$ is a *star-unit* otherwise.

If $x \in L_1$ belongs to a P_2-unit of T_1, then an appended P_2 associated with x we call a Type-1 appended P_2, while if $x \in L_1$ belongs to a star-unit of T_1, then an appended P_2 associated with x we call a Type-2 appended P_2.

For each vertex v that is the central vertex of a star-unit of T_1, we denote the two leaf neighbors of v in T_1 that do not belong to the underlying tree T_0 by a_v and b_v. If $a_v \in L_1$, then a_v has appended P_2's in T and, by construction, b_v remains a leaf in T (since L_1 is a 2-packing). In this case, we say that v and b_v are *blocked vertices*. Similarly, if b_v has appended P_2's in T, then v and a_v are blocked vertices. If a_v and b_v are both leaves of T, then only v is a blocked vertex. We shall adopt the convention that if one of a_v or b_v is a blocked vertex of T_1, then renaming vertices if necessary, b_v is the blocked vertex.

4 Main Result

By Theorem 2, every connected graph G of order $n \geq 3$ satisfies $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G) \leq (n+1)/2$. If T is a tree of order $n \geq 3$ and $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = (n+1)/2$, then by Theorem 3, T is a subdivided star. Our aim in this paper is to characterize the trees T of order $n \geq 4$ satisfying $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = n/2$. We shall prove the following result.

Theorem 5 *Let T be a tree of order $n \geq 4$. If $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = n/2$, then $T \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the order $n \geq 4$ of a tree T satisfying $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = n/2$. If $n = 4$, then either $T = P_4$ or $T = K_{1,3}$. In both cases, $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = 2 = n/2$. If $T = P_4$ (respectively, $T = K_{1,3}$), then $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with P_2 (respectively, K_1) as the unique underlying tree and the tree T itself as the corresponding base tree. This establishes the base case. Let $n \geq 6$ and assume that if T' is a tree of order n' where $4 \leq n' < n$ satisfying $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = n'/2$, then $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. Let T be a tree of order n satisfying $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = n/2$. Our aim is to show that $T \in \mathcal{T}$. For this purpose, we introduce some additional notation.

For a subtree T' of the tree T that belongs to the family $\mathcal{T}$, we adopt the following notation in our proof. Let T_0' be an underlying tree of T' with corresponding base tree T_1'. For each vertex $x \in V(T_1')$, we let $N_x = N_{T'}(x) \setminus V(T_1')$, and so N_x consists of all neighbors of x in T' that do not belong to the base tree T_1'. Further, we let L_x consist of all leaves of T' at distance 2 from x that do not belong to the base tree T_1'. Necessarily, a vertex in N_x is a support vertex of T' that belongs to a P_2 appended to x, while a vertex in L_x is a leaf of T' that belongs to a P_2 appended to x.

Let A be the vertex set of the underlying tree T_0'; that is, $A = V(T_0')$. Let B be the set of vertices in the base tree T_1' that do not belong to the underlying tree T_0'; that is, $B = V(T_1') \setminus V(T_0')$. Further, let B_1 be the set of all central vertices of star-units of T_1'. Let $C = V(T') \setminus V(T_1')$ be the set of vertices of T' that belong to a Type-1 or Type-2 appended P_2. We note that (A, B, C) is a partition of the vertex set $V(T')$, where possibly $C = \emptyset$. Let C_1 (respectively, C_2) be the set of all leaves (respectively, support vertices) of T' that do not belong to the base tree T_1'. We note that (C_1, C_2) is a partition of the set C. Let

$$D' = A \cup B_1 \cup C_1.$$

Then the set D' is a NTD-set of T' (recall that $n' \geq 4$). Since $|D'| = n'/2 = \gamma_{\rm nt}(T')$, the set D' is therefore a $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T')$-set.

For each vertex $x \in A$, we let A_x be the set of neighbors of x in A that have degree 2 in T' and belong to a P_2-unit in T_1'. Let B_x be the set of all vertices in B that are neighbors of vertices in A_x and let C_x be the set of all vertices of C_2 that are neighbors of vertices in B_x. Further, let D_x be the set of all vertices of C_1 that are neighbors of vertices in C_x. We note that each vertex in C_x is a support vertex of T' that belongs to a Type-1 appended P_2, while each vertex in D_x is a leaf of T' that belongs to a Type-1 appended P_2. We note that $|A_x| = |B_x|$ and $|C_x| = |D_x|$, although possibly $A_x = \emptyset$ (in which case $B_x = \emptyset$). Further we let A_x^1 be the set of vertices in A_x that are support vertices in T' and we let B_x^1 be the set of leaf-neighbors of vertices in A_x. Possibly, $A_x^1 = \emptyset$. We note that $|A_x^1| = |B_x^1|$. If $A_x \neq \emptyset$ and $A_x = A_x^1$, then B_x is the set B_x^1 of leaves of T' (and in this case $C_x = D_x = \emptyset$).

We now return to our proof of Theorem 5. If T is a star, then $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = 2 < n/2$, a contradiction. If T is a double star, then the two vertices that are not leaves form a NTD-set, implying that $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = 2 < n/2$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathrm{diam}(T) \geq 4$. Let P be a longest path in T and suppose that P is an (r, u)-path. Necessarily, r and u are leaves in T. We now root the tree T at the vertex r. Let v be the parent of u, and let w be the parent of v in the rooted tree T. Among all such paths P, we may assume that P is chosen so that $d_T(v)$ is minimum. Thus if P' is an arbitrary longest path in T and P' is an (r', u')-path with v' the neighbor of u' on P', then $d_T(v') \geq d_T(v)$.

We proceed further with the following claim.

Claim A *If $d_T(v) = 2$, then $T \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof of Claim A. Suppose that $d_T(v) = 2$. Let $T' = T - \{u, v\}$ have order n', and so $n' = n - 2 \geq 4$. Since n is even, so too is n'. By Theorem 2, $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T') \leq n'/2$. Let D^* be a $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T')$-set. If $w \in D^*$, let $D = D^* \cup \{v\}$. If $w \notin D^*$, let $D = D^* \cup \{u\}$. In both cases, the set D is a NTD-set of T, and so

$$\frac{n}{2} = \gamma_{\rm nt}(T) \leq |D| = |D^*| + 1 \leq \frac{n'}{2} + 1 = \frac{n}{2}.$$

Hence we must have equality throughout the above inequality chain. In particular, this implies that $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T') = n'/2$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to the tree T', we have

$T' \in \mathcal{T}$. Adopting our earlier notation, let $D' = A \cup B_1 \cup C_1$ and recall that D' is a $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T')$-set. We now consider the parent, w, of the vertex v in the rooted tree T. If $w \in A$, then $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[A \cup \{v\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[A \cup B \cup \{u, v\}]$ as the corresponding base tree. If $w \in B$ and w is not a blocked vertex, then $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with T'_0 as an underlying tree of T and T'_1 as the corresponding base tree. Therefore, we may assume that either $w \in B$ and w is a blocked vertex or $w \in C$, for otherwise $T \in \mathcal{T}$ as desired. We proceed further by considering the following three cases.

Case 1. $w \in B$ and w is a blocked vertex. Thus, w is a blocked vertex contained in a star-unit of T'_1. Let x be the vertex of A that belongs to the star-unit containing w and let y be the central vertex of the star-unit. If $w \in B_1$ (and so, $w = y$), then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A^1_x \cup \{x\})) \cup (B^1_x \cup \{v\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + |B^1_x| - |A^1_x| = |D'| = n'/2 = n/2 - 1$, implying that $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) < n/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $w \notin B_1$ and w is therefore a leaf-neighbor of y in the star-unit that contains it. Recall that a_y and b_y denote the two leaf-neighbors of y in the star-unit that do not belong to A. Since w is a blocked vertex, by convention we have $w = b_y$. We note that at least one Type-2 P_2 is appended to a_y in order for b_y to be a blocked vertex. If $|A| \geq 2$, then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_x \cup D_x \cup \{x\})) \cup (B_x \cup C_x \cup \{u\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + (|B_x| - |A_x|) + (|C_x| - |D_x|) = |D'|$, a contradiction. Hence, A consists only of the vertex x. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[\{v, w\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[\{u, v, w, x, y, a_y\}]$ as the corresponding base tree.

Case 2. $w \in C$ and w belongs to a Type-1 appended P_2. Suppose firstly that w is a leaf of T', and so $w \in C_1$. Let x be the neighbor of w that belongs to C_2, let y be the neighbor of x that belongs to B and let z be the neighbor of y that belongs to A. If the vertex z has a neighbor in A that is not a support vertex of degree 2 in T', then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A^1_z \cup \{w, z\})) \cup (B^1_z \cup \{u, x\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + |B^1_z| - |A^1_z| = |D'|$, a contradiction. Hence, $A = \{z\}$ or every neighbor of z that belongs to A is a support vertex of degree 2 in T'. In this case, $A = A^1_z \cup \{z\}$, $C_2 = N_y$ and $C_1 = L_y$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[N_y \cup \{y\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[C \cup \{y, z\}]$ as the corresponding base tree.

Suppose secondly that w is a support vertex of T', and so $w \in C_2$. Let x be the leaf-neighbor of w in T'. Let y be the neighbor of w that belongs to B and let z be the neighbor of y that belongs to A. If the vertex z has a neighbor in A that is not a support vertex of degree 2 in T', then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A^1_z \cup \{x, z\})) \cup (B^1_z \cup \{v, w\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + |B^1_z| - |A^1_z| = |D'|$, a contradiction. Hence, $A = \{z\}$ or every neighbor of z that belongs to A is a support vertex of degree 2 in T'. In this case,

$A = A_z^1 \cup \{z\}$, $C_2 = N_y$ and $C_1 = L_y$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[N_y \cup \{v, y\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[C \cup \{u, v, y, z\}]$ as the corresponding base tree.

Case 3. $w \in C$ and w belongs to a Type-2 appended P_2. Suppose firstly that w is a leaf of T', and so $w \in C_1$. Let x be the neighbor of w that belongs to C_2. Let a_y be the neighbor of x that belongs to B and let y be the central vertex of the star-unit that contains a_y. We note that b_y is a leaf in T'. Let z be the neighbor of y that belongs to A. If the vertex z has a neighbor in A that is not a support vertex of degree 2 in T', then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z^1 \cup \{w, y, z\})) \cup (B_z^1 \cup \{u, x, b_y\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'|$, a contradiction. Hence, $A = \{z\}$ or every neighbor of z that belongs to A is a support vertex of degree 2 in T'. In this case, $A = A_z^1 \cup \{z\}$ and $C_2 = N_{a_y}$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[C_2 \cup \{a_y\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[C \cup \{y, a_y, b_y, z\}]$ as the corresponding base tree.

Suppose secondly that w is a support vertex of T', and so $w \in C_2$. Let x be the leaf-neighbor of w in T'. Let a_y be the neighbor of w that belongs to B and let y be the central vertex of the star-unit that contains a_y. Let z be the neighbor of y that belongs to A. If the vertex z has a neighbor in A that is not a support vertex of degree 2 in T', then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z^1 \cup \{x, y, z\})) \cup (B_z^1 \cup \{v, w, b_y\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'|$, a contradiction. Hence, $A = \{z\}$ or every neighbor of z that belongs to A is a support vertex of degree 2 in T'. In this case, $A = A_z^1 \cup \{z\}$ and $C_2 = N_{a_y}$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[C_2 \cup \{v, a_y\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[C \cup \{u, v, y, a_y, b_y, z\}]$ as the corresponding base tree. In all three cases above, we have that $T \in \mathcal{T}$. This completes the proof of Claim A. (□)

By Claim A, we may assume that $d_T(v) \geq 3$, for otherwise $T \in \mathcal{T}$ as desired. By our choice of the path P, every child of w that is not a leaf has degree at least as large as $d_T(v)$. Let x be the parent of w in T. Since $\mathrm{diam}(T) \geq 4$, we note that $x \neq r$, and so $d_T(x) \geq 2$. Let w have $\ell \geq 0$ leaf-neighbors and $k \geq 1$ children that are support vertices. Let W be the set consisting of the vertex w and its k children that are support vertices. Then, $|W| = k+1$ and, as observed earlier, every vertex in $W \setminus \{w\}$ has degree at least $d_T(v) \geq 3$. Let the subtree, T_w, of T rooted at w have order n_w, and so $n_w \geq 3k + \ell + 1$. Let $T' = T - V(T_w)$ be the tree obtained from T by deleting the vertices in the subtree T_w of T rooted at w. Let T' have order n'. Then, $n' \geq 2$ and $n' = n - n_w$.

Claim B *If $n' = 2$, then $T \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof of Claim B. Suppose that $n' = 2$. Then, $n \geq 3k + \ell + 3$ and the set $W \cup \{x\}$ is a NTD-set of T', and so $n/2 = \gamma_{\mathrm{nt}}(T) \leq |W| + 1 = k + 2 \leq k + (k + \ell + 3)/2 \leq n/2$. Hence we must have equality throughout this inequality chain, implying that $k = 1$, $\ell = 0$, $n_w = 4$ and $n = 6$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[\{w, x\}]$ as the underlying tree of T and T itself as the corresponding base tree. □

By Claim B, we may assume that $n' \geq 3$, for otherwise $T \in \mathcal{T}$ as desired. Applying Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 to the tree T', we have that $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T') \leq (n'+1)/2$, with equality if and only if T' is a subdivided star.

Claim C *$T' \in \mathcal{T}$, $d_T(w) = 2$, and $d_T(v) = 3$.*

Proof of Claim C. We show firstly that $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T') \leq n'/2$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T') = (n'+1)/2$ and T' is a subdivided star. Let y be the link vertex of T', and let Y_1 and Y_2 be the set of vertices at distance 1 and 2, respectively, from y in T'. Select an arbitrary vertex $y_2 \in Y_2$ and let y_1 be the common neighbor of y and y_2, and so yy_1y_2 is a path in T'. Renaming vertices if necessary, we may assume that $x \in \{y, y_1, y_2\}$. If $x = y$, let $Y = Y_2$. If $x = y_1$, let $Y = (Y_2 \setminus \{y_2\}) \cup \{x\}$. If $x = y_2$, let $Y = (Y_1 \setminus \{y_1\}) \cup \{y\}$. In all three cases, $|Y| = (n'-1)/2$ and the set $W \cup Y$ is a NTD-set of T. Recall that $n_w \geq 3k + \ell + 1$ and $n' = n - n_w$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) &\leq |Y| + |W| \\
&= \frac{n'-1}{2} + k + 1 \\
&\leq \frac{n - 3k - \ell - 2}{2} + k + 1 \\
&= \frac{n - k - \ell}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{n-1}{2},
\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Therefore, $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T') \leq n'/2$. Every $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T')$-set can be extended to a NTD-set of T by adding to it the set W. Hence,

$$\frac{n}{2} = \gamma_{\rm nt}(T) \leq \gamma_{\rm nt}(T') + |W| \leq \frac{n'}{2} + k + 1 \leq \frac{n - k - \ell + 1}{2} \leq \frac{n}{2}.$$

Consequently, we must have equality throughout this inequality chain, implying that $k = 1$, $\ell = 0$, $d_T(w) = 2$, $d_T(v) = 3$, and $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T') = n'/2$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to the tree T' of (even) order $n' \geq 4$, we deduce that $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. □

By Claim C, $d_T(w) = 2$ and $d_T(v) = 3$. Thus, $N(w) = \{v, x\}$. Let u_1 and u_2 be the two children of v where $u = u_1$. By Claim C, $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. Adopting our earlier notation, let T' have order n'. In this case, $n' = n - 4$. Further, let $D' = A \cup B_1 \cup C_1$ and recall that D' is a $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T')$-set. We now consider the parent, x, of the vertex w in the rooted tree T. If $x \in A$, then $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[A \cup \{w\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[A \cup B \cup N[v]]$ as the corresponding base tree. Hence we may assume that $x \in B \cup C$, for otherwise $T \in \mathcal{T}$ as desired.

Claim D *If $x \in B$, then $T \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof of Claim D. Suppose that $x \in B$. We consider two subclaims.

Claim D.1 *If x belongs to a P_2-unit in T_1', then $T \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof of Claim D.1 Suppose that x belongs to a P_2-unit in T_1'. Let y be the neighbor of x that belongs to A. If the vertex y has a neighbor in A that is not a support vertex of degree 2 in T', then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_y^1 \cup \{y\})) \cup (B_y^1 \cup \{v, w\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + 1 + (|B_y^1| - |A_y^1|) = |D'| + 1 = n'/2 + 1 = n/2 - 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $A = \{y\}$ or every neighbor of y that belongs to A is a support vertex of degree 2 in T'. In this case, $A = A_y^1 \cup \{y\}$, $C_2 = N_x$ and $C_1 = L_x$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[N_x \cup \{w, x\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[C \cup \{u_1, u_2, v, w, x, y\}]$ as the corresponding base tree. (□)

Claim D.2 *If x belongs to a star-unit in T_1', then $T \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof of Claim D.2. Suppose that x belongs to a star-unit in T_1'. Let z be the vertex of A that belongs to the star-unit containing x and let y be the central vertex of the star-unit. If $x \in B_1$ (and so, $x = y$), then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z^1 \cup \{z\})) \cup (B_z^1 \cup \{v, w\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'|+1 = n/2-1$, a contradiction. Hence, $x \notin B_1$ and x is therefore a leaf-neighbor in its star-unit. Recall that a_y and b_y denote the two leaf-neighbors of y in the star-unit that do not belong to A. By convention the vertex b_y is a leaf in T' and the vertex a_y has $\ell \geq 0$ Type-2 P_2's appended to it.

Suppose $x = a_y$. If the vertex z has a neighbor in A that is not a support vertex of degree 2 in T', then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z^1 \cup \{y, z\})) \cup (B_z^1 \cup \{b_y, v, w\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $A = \{z\}$ or every neighbor of z that belongs to A is a support vertex of degree 2 in T'. In this case $A = A_z^1 \cup \{z\}$, $C_2 = N_{a_y}$ and $C_1 = L_{a_y}$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[C_2 \cup \{w, a_y\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[C \cup \{a_y, b_y, u_1, u_2, v, w, y, z\}]$ as the corresponding base tree.

Suppose that $x = b_y$. If a_y is a leaf of T', then renaming a_y and b_y, we may assume that $x = a_y$. In this case, we have shown that $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Hence we may assume that a_y has at least one Type-2 P_2 appended to it. If $|A| \geq 2$, then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z \cup D_z \cup \{z\})) \cup (B_z \cup C_z \cup \{v, w\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $A = \{z\}$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[\{b_y, w\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[\{a_y, b_y, u_1, u_2, v, w, y, z\}]$ as the corresponding base tree. This completes the proof of Claim D.2. (□)

Claim D now follows from Claim D.1 and Claim D.2. □

By Claim D, we may assume that $x \in C$, for otherwise $T \in \mathcal{T}$ as desired.

Claim E *If x belongs to a Type-1 appended P_2, then $T \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof of Claim E. Suppose that x belongs to a Type-1 appended P_2. Suppose firstly that x is a leaf of T', and so $x \in C_1$. Let y_2 be the neighbor of x that belongs to C_2, let y be the neighbor of y_1 that belongs to B and let z be the neighbor of y that belongs to A. If y has degree at least 3 in T', then $|N_y| \geq 2$ and the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z^1 \cup L_y \cup \{z\})) \cup (B_z^1 \cup (N_y \setminus \{y_1\}) \cup \{v, w, y\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'|+(|B_z^1|-|A_z^1|)+(|N_y|-|L_y|)+3-2 = |D'|+1$, a contradiction. Hence, y has degree 2 in T'. If $|A| \geq 2$, then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z \cup D_z \cup \{z\})) \cup (B_x \cup C_x \cup \{v, w, y\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'|+(|B_x|-|A_x|)+(|C_x|-|D_x|)+3-2 = |D'|+1$, a contradiction. Hence, A consists only of the vertex z. Therefore, T is obtained from the path u_1vwxy_1yz by adding a new vertex u_2 and the edge u_2v. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[\{w, x\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[\{u_1, u_2, v, w, x, y_1\}]$ as the corresponding base tree.

Suppose secondly that x is a support vertex of T', and so $x \in C_2$. Let x_1 be the leaf-neighbor of x in T'. Let y be the neighbor of x that belongs to B and let z be the neighbor of y that belongs to A. If the vertex z has a neighbor in A that is not a support vertex of degree 2 in T', then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z^1 \cup \{x_1, z\})) \cup (B_z^1 \cup \{v, w, x\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $A = \{z\}$ or every neighbor of z that belongs to A is a support vertex of degree 2 in T'. In this case, $A = A_z^1 \cup \{z\}$, $C_2 = N_y$ and $C_1 = L_y$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[N_y \cup \{w, y\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[C \cup \{u_1, u_2, v, w, y, z\}]$ as the corresponding base tree. □

By Claim E, we may assume that x belongs to a Type-2 appended P_2, for otherwise $T \in \mathcal{T}$ as desired.

Claim F *The vertex x is a support vertex of T'.*

Proof of Claim F. Suppose to the contrary that x is a leaf of T', and so $x \in C_1$. Let x_1 be the neighbor of x that belongs to C_2. Let a_y be the neighbor of x_1 that belongs to B and let y be the central vertex of the star-unit that contains a_y. We note that b_y is a leaf in T'. Let z be the neighbor of y that belongs to A. Then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z^1 \cup \{x, z\})) \cup (B_z^1 \cup \{v, w, a_y\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + 1$, a contradiction. □

We now return to the proof of Theorem 5 one last time. By Claim F, the vertex x is a support vertex of T', and so $x \in C_2$. Let x_1 be the leaf-neighbor of x in T'. Let a_y be

the neighbor of x that belongs to B and let y be the central vertex of the star-unit that contains a_y. Let z be the neighbor of y that belongs to A. If the vertex z has a neighbor in A that is not a support vertex of degree 2 in T', then the set

$$(D' \setminus (A_z^1 \cup \{x_1, y, z\})) \cup (B_z^1 \cup \{v, w, x, b_y\})$$

is a NTD-set of T of size $|D'| + 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $A = \{z\}$ or every neighbor of z that belongs to A is a support vertex of degree 2 in T'. In this case, $A = A_z^1 \cup \{z\}$ and $C_2 = N_{a_y}$. Thus, $T \in \mathcal{T}$ with $T[C_2 \cup \{w, a_y\}]$ as an underlying tree of T and $T[C \cup \{u_1, u_2, v, w, y, a_y, b_y, z\}]$ as the corresponding base tree. This completes the proof of Theorem 5. □

5 Closing Remark

As a consequence of our tree characterization provided in Theorem 5, we remark that a complete solution to the Arumugam-Sivagnanam Problem 1 can be obtained as follows. Let G be a connected graph of (even) order $n \geq 4$ satisfying $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G) = n/2$ and consider an arbitrary spanning tree T of G. By Theorem 2, $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) \leq n/2$. Every NTD-set of T is an NTD-set of G, implying that $n/2 = \gamma_{\rm nt}(G) \leq \gamma_{\rm nt}(T) \leq n/2$. Consequently, $\gamma_{\rm nt}(T) = n/2$. Thus, by Theorem 5, $T \in \mathcal{T}$. This is true for every spanning tree T of the graph G. An exhaustive case analysis of the allowable edges that can be added to trees in the family $\mathcal{T}$ without lowering their neighborhood total domination number produces the connected graphs G of order $n \geq 4$ satisfying $\gamma_{\rm nt}(G) = n/2$. Since our detailed case analysis of the resulting such graphs exceeds the length of the current paper, we omit the details here which can be found in [9].

References

[1] S. Arumugam, C. Sivagnanam, Neighborhood total domination in graphs. *Opuscula Mathematica* **31** (2011), 519–531.

[2] R. C. Brigham, J. R. Carrington, and R. P. Vitray, Connected graphs with maximum total domination number. *J. Combin. Comput. Combin. Math.* **34** (2000), 81–96.

[3] E. J. Cockayne, R. M. Dawes, and S. T. Hedetniemi, Total domination in graphs. *Networks* **10** (1980), 211–219.

[4] G. Domke, J. H. Hattingh, M. A. Henning, and L. Markus, Restrained domination in graphs with minimum degree two. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **35** (2000), 239–254.

[5] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater, *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs*, Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, 1998.

[6] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater (eds), *Domination in Graphs: Advanced Topics*, Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, 1998.

[7] M. A. Henning, Recent results on total domination in graphs: A survey. *Discrete Math.* **309** (2009), 32–63.

[8] M. A. Henning and N. J. Rad, Bounds on neighborhood total domination in graphs. *Discrete Applied Math.* **161** (2013), 2460–2466.

[9] M. A. Henning and K. Wash, Graphs with large neighborhood total domination number, mansucript.

[10] M. A. Henning and A. Yeo, *Total domination in graphs (Springer Monographs in Mathematics)* 2013. ISBN: 978-1-4614-6524-9 (Print) 978-1-4614-6525-6 (Online).